



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Perhaps the best proof of it is their apparent instability. Of all the elaborate symbolism which has been suggested for the Gothic cathedral, the most vital and most perfect may be that the slender nervure, the springing motion of the broken arch, the leap downwards of the flying buttress,—the visible effort to throw off a visible strain,—never let us forget that Faith alone supports it, and that, if Faith fails, Heaven is lost. The equilibrium is visibly delicate beyond the line of safety; danger lurks in every stone. The peril of the heavy tower, of the restless vault, of the vagrant buttress; the uncertainty of logic, the inequalities of the syllogism, the irregularities of the mental mirror,—all these haunting nightmares of the Church are expressed as strongly by the Gothic cathedral as though it had been the cry of human suffering, and as no emotion had ever been expressed before or is likely to find expression again. The delight of its aspirations is flung up to the sky. The pathos of its self-distrust and anguish of doubt is buried in the earth as its last secret. You can read out of it whatever else pleases your youth and confidence; to me, this is all.

HENRY OSBORN TAYLOR.

*Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum, 1066–1154.* Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes by H. W. C. DAVIS, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, with the assistance of R. J. WHITWELL. Volume I. *Regesta Willelmi Conquestoris et Willelmi Rufi.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1913. Pp. xliii, 159.)

It is characteristic of the neglect of diplomatic studies in England that the student of English history has at his disposal none of the *Jahrbücher*, *regesta*, or *catalogues d'actes* which clear the way and smooth the path of the Continental investigator. The imposing series of *Calendars* deal, so far as British documents are concerned, with materials already handed down in chronological order, and where the labor of arrangement has not been performed by the scribes of the Middle Ages, the user of records is left to shift for himself. Even when a scholar of Mr. Round's competence and distinction is set to calendar documents in France, he is sent, not to the materials themselves, but to a group of loosely made transcripts in the Public Record Office. It is, accordingly, a service of the first importance to the historical profession that Mr. Davis has undertaken in preparing a series of *regesta* of the charters of the Anglo-Norman kings. His qualification to deal with this period has been shown by a number of special investigations, as well as by an admirable general volume, and he possesses the perseverance and attention to detail necessary to carry so considerable a task to its end. He has had the advantage of generous co-operation at the Record Office and the British Museum and in cathedral archives, as well as of the assistance of Mr. Whitwell at Oxford, and has been able to increase as well as to set in order the available store of royal charters. Thus, besides the analyses of four hundred and ninety-five documents of the reigns of William the Conqueror and William Rufus contained in the present volume, there is also an ap-

pendix of ninety-two charters and writs printed in extenso, most of them for the first time. Each of the *regesta* contains a brief analysis in English with the list of witnesses in full and references to parallel sources, notably Domesday. The date is determined as closely as possible, and doubtful or spurious documents are indicated, but without any full discussion of their genuineness. The entries are numbered, an improvement over most of the *Calendars* issued by the Record Office, and there are abundant indexes, but the absence of references in the *regesta* to the texts printed in the appendix is inexcusable. We are glad to learn that the succeeding volume, devoted to Henry I., will be even richer in new documents.

As regards the general plan of the work, the principal defect lies in including a number of charters issued "in and for Normandy" without any exploration of French archives and libraries. Much can of course be said for covering documents issued in Normandy by English kings or for English religious houses, but no sound reason can be advanced for going further without attacking the whole problem seriously and systematically. As it is, the selection of material is wholly accidental, being confined to English manuscripts and to such printed collections as have come under the editor's notice, and the result is confusion. The matter is made worse by including a dozen readily accessible charters of Robert Courthose, who never ruled in England and has no place in an English calendar. Such a method leads, not only to omissions, even of printed material, but also to errors in connection with the documents actually treated. Thus if Mr. Davis, or Mr. Round before him, had ever seen the cartulary of Rouen cathedral or the text printed from the original in the *Histoire de la Maison d'Harcourt* (III. 34), he could have assigned to no. 384 its exact date of 1095. He could also have found in the *Revue Catholique de Normandie* (X. 283) the full text of no. 376, which he knows only from a citation, and in Bessin's *Concilia* (p. 75) a text of no. 146a different from the one he has reprinted in the appendix. These sporadic Norman documents also mar the work by bringing in place-names which have not been identified, and isolated chaplains for whom the editor has created a "Norman chancery", whatever that may have been.

The introduction, as compared with the introductions to Continental works of the same type, is meagre, especially on questions of diplomatics. The different types of documents are dismissed in a paragraph without any discussion of matters of style or external form. There are a few good pages on the Anglo-Saxon chancery, leading to the conclusion that "the organization, though not the name, of the chancery can be traced back at least to the early years of Edward the Confessor"; but the treatment of the chancery of William I. and William II. is unsatisfactory, consisting merely of lists of chaplains and a brief account of the succession of the chancellors. The biographical notices of the chancellors contain irrelevant matter, like the statement that Maurice was worldly

and "a loose liver", which should have been sacrificed to a fuller treatment of the questions which are here of primary importance. Thus there is no discussion of the date of Herfast's promotion to his bishopric or of the kind of problem raised by his appearance as chaplain in no. 29 a year after witnessing as chancellor in no. 22. The account of the household officers is better, and there are some interesting pages on justice and administration in the charters, though the new material is less than one could hope.

Taken as a whole, Mr. Davis has given us an intelligent and exceedingly useful piece of work which deserves to be continued even beyond 1154. It is, however, to be hoped that in succeeding volumes extraneous matter may be excluded and topics directly connected with charters may be treated with the fullness which they deserve. There is also room for greater accuracy in detail and greater finish of workmanship.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

*A Calendar of the Feet of Fines relating to the County of Huntingdon, levied in the King's Court from the Fifth Year of Richard I. to the End of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1194-1603.* Edited by G. J. TURNER, M.A. [Cambridge Antiquarian Society, publication no. XXXVII.] (Cambridge: The Society. 1913. Pp. clxiv, 300.)

WITHIN the narrow limits of an introduction to this calendar the evidence for early English legal history is again examined and interpreted by one of England's most able legal historians, and the conclusions reached, some of which were discussed with Maitland, are not always in accord with more or less generally accepted theories. The subject-matter is varied. There are useful notes, marked by Mr. Turner's very exact scholarship, on the extension of proper names, the use of surnames, titles, and styles, and a long and valuable discussion of the nature of fines and the intricate procedure by which they were levied. The most important of Mr. Turner's suggestions, however, are based upon what is passed by the fine, and relate to early agrarian history and land measures. The earlier manor he believes to have been the "mansion" of the lord, with appurtenant judicial and agrarian rights. He shows that the creation of new manors was not in every case the result of subinfeudation, and thus makes more clear the difficult working of *Quia Emptores*. He believes that changes in the units of measurement of land are to be ascribed not to the coming of new conquering races but to the natural shifts of agricultural systems. He suggests that the bovate, not essentially a Danish measure, was the territorial holding of the ordinary peasant in the north, that it contained twelve and a half customary acres of twenty-five strips, thus proving itself older than the two-field system, that it was measured by the customary rod of six yards of the north, and that it was in no way a measure of economic necessity,